

Appl. No. 10/810,023
Amdt. Dated March 28, 2007
Reply to Advisory Action of February 12, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 28 2007

REMARKS

Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1 and 18. The subject matter, amended in the specification and claims 1 and 18, is clearly shown in FIG. 5 of the original files. Thus, no new matter is entered by these amendments

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (U.S. 5,548,181).

In the Advisory Action, it is submitted that Applicants' arguments, in the last response, are not persuasive. Applicants have amended claim 1 without any new matter being entered, and respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

...

an insulative layer including a first portion directly formed on the upper surface of the shadow mask, a plurality of second portions, and a third portion directly formed on the lower surface of the shadow mask, the second portions disposed in the respective openings and connecting the first portion with the third portion. (Emphasis added.)

With respect to amended claim 1, Applicants would emphasize that Jones

Appl. No. 10/810,023
Amdt. Dated March 28, 2007
Reply to Advisory Action of February 12, 2007

et al. fails to disclose or suggest a shadow mask and an insulative layer directly formed on both the upper and lower surfaces of the shadow mask.

Jones et al. discloses (Column 13, lines 21-26; Fig. 74) that a spacer 115 incorporates an insulator 120, which is made of a silica material and is coated with a low electron emission coating 121, such as magnesium oxide (MgO), and a buried conductor 122 formed of a suitable material, such molybdenum or aluminum, and connected to ground. **FIG. 74** of Jones et al. further shows that the conductor 122 is disposed directly under the insulator 120 and that the low electron emission coating 121 is formed on an upper surface of the insulator, inner edges of the insulator and the conductor, and a lower surface of the conductor. Simply stated, the insulator 120, as defined by Jones et al., is only formed on one side of the conductor 122; and, even if the low electron emission coating 121 is considered, for the sake of argument, to be an insulative layer, such a coating 121 does not directly contact both the upper and lower surfaces of the conductor 122. For such reasons, Jones et al. '181 fails to disclose or suggest a shadow mask and an insulative layer directly formed on both the upper and lower surfaces of the shadow mask, as essentially required by amended claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the term "shadow mask" has an accepted meaning in the art and that the buried conductor 122 shown in Fig. 74 of Jones et al. does not qualify as a "shadow mask". In particular, the conductor 122 is expressly configured (i.e., structured and arranged) within the spacer 115 to function and operate in a manner distinct from a shadow mask. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the subject matter of claim 1, as amended, is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by

Appl. No. 10/810,023
Amdt. Dated March 28, 2007
Reply to Advisory Action of February 12, 2007

Jones et al. '181.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is not taught, or suggested by Jones et al. '181 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Furthermore, the shadow mask of the presently claimed device produces new and unexpected results. A shadow mask used in the device of claim 1 can be made by a known technology in the flat panel display field with a high precision, and the claimed barrier array is convenient and inexpensive to make. Additionally, no insulator is disposed between the shadow mask and the insulative layer of amended claim 1, thereby decreasing the cost of the fabrication of the presently claimed device. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Jones et al. '181, taken alone or in combination with any other cited reference, under U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is directly dependent from now-allowable claim 1, and, as such, Applicants submit that claim 3 should also be allowable.

Claim 18, as amended, recites in part:

...

an insulative layer including a first portion directly formed on the upper surface of the metal plate and a plurality of second portions, the second portions extending from the first

Appl. No. 10/810,023
Amdt. Dated March 28, 2007
Reply to Advisory Action of February 12, 2007

portion into the respective openings and **directly formed on inner edges of the metal plate that bound the respective openings.** (Emphasis added.)

For similar reasons asserted with respect to amended claim 1, **the low electron emission coating 121 disclosed by Jones et al. does not directly coat and/cover the upper surface of the conductor 122** because the insulator 120 is disposed between such layers. Thus, Jones et al. '181 fails to disclose or suggest a metal plate and an insulative layer that having a first portion directly formed on the upper surface of the metal plate, as required by amended claim 18.

Therefore, amended claim 18 is not taught or suggested by Jones et al. '181 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Furthermore, the metal plate and the insulative layer of the present invention, as provided in amended claim 18, produce new and unexpected results, as set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 18 is patentable over Jones et al. '181 or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, under U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Accordingly, claim 18, as amended, is in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 20 is directly dependent from now-allowable claim 18, and, as such, Applicants submit that claim 20 should also be allowable.

Appl. No. 10/810,023
Amdt. Dated March 28, 2007
Reply to Advisory Action of February 12, 2007

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

(i) Claims 4, 5 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (U.S. 5,548,181).

Claims 4 and 5 are each directly dependent from claim 1. As detailed above, claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Jones et al. under 102 and 103. Therefore, claims 4 and 5 should also be allowable, since each of them includes the patentably distinguishing features of claim 1.

Claim 22 is directly dependent from claim 18. As detailed above, claim 18 is submitted to be patentable over Jones et al. under 102 and 103. Therefore, claim 22 should also be allowable, since it includes the patentably distinguishing features of claim 18.


(ii) Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (U.S. 5,548,181) in view of Lee et al. (U.S. 6,508,685B1; of record).

Claim 2 is directly dependent from claim 1. As detailed above, claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Jones et al. under 102 and 103. Therefore, claim 2 should also be allowable, since it includes the patentably distinguishing features of claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/810,023
Amdt. Dated March 28, 2007
Reply to Advisory Action of February 12, 2007

In view of the foregoing, the present application as defined in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Zhaofu Hu et al.

By 
Jeffrey T. Knapp
Registration No.: 45,384
Foxconn International, Inc.
1650 Memorex Drive
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: 714/626-1229